

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-14, 16-27, and 29-40 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27, and 37 being the independent claims. Applicants propose amending claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, and 27. Claims 2, 5, 8, 15, and 28 are hereby cancelled. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action dated November 23, 2007, claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1, 5, 7, 14, 18, 20, 27, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,159,210 issued to Griffin et al (hereinafter referred to as “Griffin”). Claims 11-13, 24-26, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,435 issued to Boebert et al (hereinafter referred to as “Boebert”). Claims 2-4, 6-10, 15-17, 19, 21-23, 28-30, 32, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Griffin in view of Boebert. The outstanding rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Chai for conducting an Examiner Interview with Applicants’ representative on January 25, 2008. Applicants believe agreement was reached regarding the cited references and claim amendments which may overcome those references.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the phrase “based on said user input and not on execution environment selection input” is unclear. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 14 to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Specifically, claims 1 and 14 now recite “wherein the user input does not contain an explicit indication of an intended execution environment”. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 7, 14, 18, 20, 27, 31, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Griffin. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. It is believed that claim 1 as amended overcomes the cited references. In particular, claim 1 recites “accepting encrypted user input from a user input device” and “decrypting said encrypted user input”. Support for this amendment can be found at least in paragraphs [0039]-[0041] of the present specification, as well as elsewhere in the specification. As discussed in the Examiner Interview, Griffin does not disclose the use of encryption in any form, or encrypting or decrypting user input.

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite “accepting output from a specific source entity within said secured execution environment and not within said second execution environment; and securely transferring said output to an output device.” Support for this amendment can be found in at least paragraphs [0049], [0050], and [0051] of the present specification, as well as elsewhere in the specification. Griffin, as admitted on page 8 of the Office Action, does not disclose accepting output from a specific source entity within said secured execution environment. Also on page 8, the Office Action asserts that Boebert discloses accepting output from a specific source entity within said secured execution environment and securely transferring said output to an output device. Applicants respectfully disagree. In Boebert, the output originates on a device, a video port, that is security neutral in that it is neither secured nor unsecured in itself. (Boebert, column 8, lines 45-63.) The output of the video port is manipulated based on the mode, which determines the security of the transfer of output. Boebert inserts an intermediate component, the video RAM, in the path when Boebert’s system is in secure, or trusted path, mode. Boebert’s video RAM is not a source entity in a secured execution environment. Boebert’s source entity is the video port, which is not within a secured execution environment. In trusted path mode, Boebert passes data from the unsecured video port through the intermediate video RAM. In contrast to claim 1, Boebert does not disclose accepting output from a **specific source entity**

within said secured execution environment and not within said second execution environment; and securely transferring said output to an output device.

Claim 1 has also been amended to recite “if said decrypted user input is intended for said secured execution environment, determining a specific destination entity within said secured execution environment for said decrypted user input, and transferring said decrypted user input to said specific destination entity”. Support for this amendment can be found at least in paragraphs [0042]-[0048] of the present specification, as well as elsewhere in the specification. As discussed in the Examiner Interview, Griffin does not disclose the use of encryption in any form, or determining destination entities for decrypted user input.

The Office Action on page 4 asserts that Griffin, column 5, lines 33-60, teaches if said user input is intended for said secured execution environment, determining a specific destination entity in said execution environment for said user input; and transferring said user input to said specific destination entity. Applicants respectfully disagree. This section of Griffin describes a system that determines on which operating system a process should by evaluating the process against sets of rules. Once evaluated, the process is allowed to run on either a guest or a host operating system. However, Griffin does not disclose determining **a specific destination entity within said execution environment** for said user input, as claimed in claim 1.

In order for a reference or references to anticipate or render a claim obvious, they must teach and/or suggest all of the recited elements as well as the arrangements of those elements. Griffin does not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Moreover, Griffin and Boebert, either taken together or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Independent claims 14 and 27 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Griffin. Claims 14 and 27 have been amended to further clarify the claimed subject matter. Amended claims 14 and 27 recite “accepting encrypted user input from a user input device”, “decrypting said encrypted user input” and “wherein the decrypted user input does not contain an explicit indication of an intended execution environment”, or language substantially similar. Therefore, Applicants assert that the relevant arguments set

forth above with regard to the rejection of claim 1 also apply to the rejection of claims 14 and 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14 and 27 are allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

In the Office Action, claims 11-13, 24-26, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Boebert. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 11 includes the element of “accepting output from a specific source entity within said secured execution environment and not within said second execution environment; and securely transferring said output to an output device.” As discussed above in regard to claim 1, Boebert requires the use of an intermediate component, the video RAM, to function in secure, or trusted path, mode. (Boebert, column 8, lines 45-63.) Boebert’s video RAM is not a source entity in a secured execution environment. Boebert’s source entity is the video port, which is not within a secured execution environment. In trusted path mode, Boebert passes data from the unsecured video port through the video RAM. In contradistinction, claim 11 discloses accepting output from a **specific source entity within said secured execution environment** and not within said second execution environment; and securely transferring said output to an output device.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, it must teach and/or suggest all of the recited elements as well as the arrangements of those elements. Boebert does not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Independent claims 24 and 37 are also rejected on substantially the same grounds as claim 11. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments set forth above in regard to the rejection of claim 11 also apply to the rejection of claims 24 and 37. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24 and 37 are allowable over the cited art, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Applicants acknowledge that the Office Action establishes additional grounds for rejection of the remaining claims, all of which are dependent upon claims 1, 11, 14, 24, 27,

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2817/301134.01
Application No.: 10/693,407
Office Action Dated: November 23, 2007

PATENT

and 37, either directly or indirectly. However, in view of the amendments and traversals set forth with respect to the independent claims, Applicants believes that all such dependent claims are in condition for allowance, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicants believe that this response completely and accurately addresses all grounds of rejection. Applicants reserve the right to challenge the rejection of any of those dependent claims in any future response that may be forthcoming.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-14, 16-27, and 29-40, is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 22, 2008

/Aaron F. Bourgeois/
Aaron F. Bourgeois
Registration No. 57,936

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439